



FAIRFAX COUNTY PARK AUTHORITY



12055 Government Center Parkway, Suite 927 • Fairfax, VA 22035-1118
703-324-8700 • Fax: 703-324-3974 • www.fairfaxcounty.gov/parks

SUMMARY
PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
Baron Cameron Park Master Plan Revision
May 7, 2013, 7:00 P.M.
Buzz Aldrin Elementary School, Reston, Va

Welcome	Sandy Stallman, Park Planning Manager
Opening Remarks	Bill Bouie, Hunter Mill Representative, Park Authority Board
Presentations	Sandy Stallman, Park Planning Manager Jay Rauschenbach, Project Manager
Moderated Public Input	Matthew Kaiser, Public Information Office

Other Staff in Attendance:

- Cindy Messinger, Acting Director
- Sara Baldwin, Chief Operating Officer
- David Bowden, Director, Planning and Development Division
- Wayne Brissey, Area 6 Manager, Park Operations Division
- Chris Scales, Region 3 Manger, Dept. of Neighborhood and Community Services
- Justin Roberson, Natural Resource Specialist, Resource Management Division
- Nicole Marko, Oak Marr RECenter Aquatics Director
- Diana Fuentes, Public Information Office
- Leila Gordon, Executive Director, Reston Community Center
- Tom Ward, Deputy Director, Reston Community Center
- Casey Hanes, Supervisor Hudgins Office

Staff presentations (available on the project website) included an overview of the Park Authority and the park master plan process, information about the site’s history and existing conditions, and the role and purpose of Baron Cameron Park as a district-serving park. In addition, Leila Gordon presented the RCC interest to build an indoor recreational facility in Baron Cameron Park.

Following staff presentations, Matthew Kaiser **moderated the public input** session to permit those in attendance to share their thoughts and suggestions for the master plan revision process. A summary of the public input is provided below.

The meeting **adjourned** after 29 speakers.

Speaker #1 (Belcastle Cluster)

- Believes the park is the wrong location for an indoor recreational facility and is concerned about traffic. Land and funds could be used for better purposes, such as improving the existing facilities and enabling residents to enjoy open space.

Speaker #2

- Would like to see the existing facilities be preserved and improved.

Speaker #3

- Feels the existing RCC swim facility at Hunter Woods is outdated and that a new recreational facility would help address this issue while keeping pace with current and future growth of Reston.

Speaker #4 (Reston Masters Swim Team)

- Reflects on the existing conditions of the RCC swim facility at Hunter Woods: the ventilation is outdated and often not working, the water is set in-between two user preferences (competitive vs. leisure/therapeutic), the size is too small, and the lack of availability due to current demands.
- Feels an indoor recreational facility would address these issues, while also providing more than just aquatics options to residents.

Speaker #5

- Does not feel RCC should fund an indoor recreational facility during the current economic climate; also concerned about traffic.
- Would prefer to see funding go towards improving the existing facilities.

Speaker #6

- Would like to better understand the demand for aquatics that is driving the need for an indoor recreational facility.
- Does not feel RCC/small tax district should fund an indoor recreational facility, but instead the county should pay for it and let Reston citizens pay user fees.

Speaker #7 (Newport Shores Cluster)

- Reflects on a recent RA survey that generated 600-700 responses to the top five priorities for Reston citizens – 1. Protecting air and water quality, 2. Preserving natural areas and open land, 3. Keeping the scenic beauty of Reston, 4. Enhancing public spaces, and 5. Reducing traffic congestion and making the community more walkable.
- Encourages the planning process to represent this contingent and subsequently not to build an indoor recreational facility in the park.

Speaker #8

- Feels the park should be preserved as open space and the planning process should consider the park more holistically than just individual needs/wants.

Speaker #9 (Reston Board of Directors)

- Is waiting to hear more information and to let the planning process unfold before taking a position.

Speaker #10 (Reston Citizen's Association)

- Does not have a position yet.
- Believes there is need for an indoor recreational facility, either by current or future demand, but such a facility should not disrupt existing public uses. Feels a location closer to the Silver Line would be a better opportunity.

Speaker #11

- Encourages the Park Authority to preserve the dog park.

Speaker #12 (Reston Soccer Association)

- Feels the rectangle fields should be preserved and improved; dog park too.
- Concerned about traffic, particularly any additional traffic generated by an indoor recreational facility. Furthermore, feels there are adequate aquatic and fitness options in Reston and that a new facility is not needed.

Speaker #13

- Feels the park should not contain any facility that would be more appropriate in an urban environment, i.e. an indoor recreational facility.
- Reflects on Park Authority precedent to underestimate impacts and subsequently encourages staff to thoroughly examine the parking situation in the park.

Speaker #14

- Hopes that if an indoor recreational facility is pursued at Baron Cameron Park, it would be state-of-the-art and innovative. However, believes there are better locations.

Speaker #15

- Feels the park should be preserved as open space; concerned about traffic.
- Encourages the planning process to consider all needs in the community, not just the swimmers.

Speaker #16 (Robert E. Simon, Founder of Reston)

- Reflects on the notion that Reston is growing and will continue to grow, therefore now is the time to address current and future demands for an indoor recreational facility that includes a 50-meter pool. Also believes a tennis facility is needed.
- Feels the park is a good location for an indoor recreational facility because the land would be free; this is just one of many considerations.
- Reflects on the notion that an indoor recreational facility would only encompass about 5 acres of the 60+ acre park, and that most existing facilities would be retained and possibly improved.
- Encourages everyone to open their perspective and not to make decisions on an indoor recreational facility until all the facts are presented.

Speaker #17

- Would like the existing fields be improved.
- Understands that swimmers have a current need, but does not feel Reston citizens should pay for it. Furthermore, reflects that the Hunter Mill District is the only district in the county without a RECenter.

Speaker #18

- Feels swimming is an exercise option for nearly everybody (competitive and leisure/therapeutic), whereas not as many people can play soccer or baseball.
- Reflects that the RCC swim facility at Hunter Woods only has 6 indoor lanes available year-round, which can't support the current demand. Feels an indoor recreational facility could help meet this demand while concurrently minimally impacting the existing uses in the park.

Speaker #19

- Concerned about stormwater runoff related to impervious surfaces, i.e. buildings and parking lots. Opposed to an indoor recreational facility based on this premise.

Speaker #20

- Surveyed 1,264 Baron Cameron Park dog park users and concluded that 100% wanted the dog park to remain and that 83% were opposed to an indoor recreational facility in the park.
- Would like to see improvements on the dog park.

Speaker #21

- Feels dog parks bring numerous individual and community benefits.

Speaker #22

- Feels the existing facilities in the park should be retained and improved; as well as the preservation and enhancement of open space.

Speaker #23 (Reston Citizen's Association Board/Reston 2020)

- Believes there is an opportunity to compromise in the planning process. However, feels small tax district should not fund an indoor recreational facility in the park since it is a district-serving park.
- Reflects that Reston contains about 40% of the county's subsidized housing; feels that commensurate tax dollars should be provided to fund an indoor recreational facility rather than solely from the small tax district.
- Encourages the planning process to take a holistic approach.

Speaker #24

- Opposed to an indoor recreational facility because open space should be preserved; also concerned about traffic.
- Feels the dog park should also be retained.

Speaker #25

- Reflects that the existing fields and parking are used to the max on the weekends; feels these uses should be retained and possibly improved.
- Concerned about traffic, particularly once the Silver Line opens.

Speaker #26

- Encourages the planning process to consider the Fairfax Connector park and ride located in the park.

Speaker #27

- Reflects on the disconnection between supply and demand of recreational facilities in the Reston area.
- Concerned about traffic, particularly once the Silver Line opens.

Speaker #28

- Encourages everyone to listen and wait for the planning process to unfold before making decisions, particularly concerning the final proposal from RCC about an indoor recreational facility.
- Feels the park can benefit from improvements.

Speaker #29

- Believes that now is the time to build a new indoor recreational facility in Reston that will serve current and future residents.